

Reply to Comment by Holas and March

R. K. Nesbet

IBM Almaden Research Center, 650 Harry Road, San Jose, CA 95120-6099, USA

(February 2, 2008)

For *Phys.Rev.A*

The accompanying Comment by A. Holas and N. H. March [Phys. Rev. A **66**, 066501 (2002)] is concerned with the issue of whether or not kinetic energy can be represented by an effective local potential, as required for an exact Thomas-Fermi theory equivalent to Kohn-Sham density-functional theory. They dispute [R.K. Nesbet, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 010502(R) (2001)], which concludes that for more than two electrons the use by Kohn and Sham of the Schrödinger kinetic energy operator is variationally correct, while the equivalent local potential required for a valid Thomas-Fermi theory, a Fréchet functional derivative of the Kohn-Sham ground-state kinetic energy functional, does not exist. The argument of Holas and March is clearly invalid for the simple example of the lowest triplet state of a two-electron atom with noninteracting electrons. Why this fails, as do earlier arguments in the literature, has been explained in recent publications, summarized here.

The principal issue in dispute is the question whether an exact *ab initio* Thomas-Fermi theory (TFT) exists for ground states, equivalent to Kohn-Sham density-functional theory (DFT). This depends on the definition of a ground-state kinetic energy functional of the electron density and on the definition and computability of its density-functional derivative. Holas and March claim that a local (Fréchet) functional derivative of the Kohn-Sham ground-state kinetic energy functional exists, as a rigorous consequence of variational theory. This cannot be true, because it would imply the equivalence of ground-state TFT and DFT, which result in clearly inconsistent variational equations for systems with more than two electrons [1].

The conclusions of the cited paper [2] are misstated by Holas and March [3]. In contrast to their allusion to "... Nesbet's worrisome claims...", which they hold to be contrary to the accepted opinion that "...DFT is fundamentally correct and internally consistent...", the analysis summarized in [2] concludes that Kohn-Sham theory correctly uses the kinetic energy operator $\hat{t} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2$ of Schrödinger, and is variationally correct in the local-density approximation(LDA). However, there is no formal proof that a local (Fréchet) functional derivative exists in general for the exchange-correlation density functional, nor for the Kohn-Sham kinetic energy functional. In fact, the latter Fréchet derivative cannot exist in a valid quantum theory for more than two electrons. This precludes an exact TFT for ground states. Because Holas and March cite standard arguments which lead to similar inconsistencies, it is important to trace the point of

failure of these arguments. This will be done here.

The fundamental incompatibility of Thomas-Fermi theory (TFT) and Kohn-Sham theory (DFT) for more than two electrons has not been widely recognized. If the argument of Holas and March and earlier conclusions in accepted literature were sound, TFT would be correct. If the two theories are incompatible, then DFT must fail, in sharp contrast to the history of applications of these theories. To illustrate this incompatibility, consider the lowest 3S state of an atom with two noninteracting electrons. Kohn-Sham theory solves the pair of Schrödinger equations

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{t}\phi_{1s} &= \{\epsilon_{1s} - v(\mathbf{r})\}\phi_{1s} \\ \hat{t}\phi_{2s} &= \{\epsilon_{2s} - v(\mathbf{r})\}\phi_{2s}.\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

The orbital wave functions are orthogonal because the energy eigenvalues are unequal. They are independently normalized to unity and are equally occupied. An equivalent TFT would use a single Lagrange multiplier μ for the global normalization constraint $\int \rho d^3\mathbf{r} = 2$. If a local density functional derivative of the kinetic energy functional T exists in the form $\frac{\delta T}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})} = v_T(\mathbf{r})$, this implies the Thomas-Fermi equation

$$v_T(\mathbf{r}) = \mu - v(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

Eqs.(1) cannot be deduced from Eq.(2), because two independent Lagrange multipliers cannot be derived from one. Unconstrained by the exclusion principle, this Thomas-Fermi equation has a ground-state solution in which the partial density ρ_{1s} is normalized to 2, while ρ_{2s} is normalized to zero. The total energy, $2\epsilon_{1s}$, is below the correct ground state. The theory fails because a single global Lagrange multiplier μ does not suffice to normalize ρ_{1s} and ρ_{2s} separately. It cannot replace the set of independent Lagrange multipliers ϵ_i required for Fermi-Dirac electrons. Any theory that produces a Fréchet derivative of a kinetic energy functional implies incorrect physics unless all ϵ_i are equal.

Holas and March present an argument which, if correct, would support the conclusion that solution of a Thomas-Fermi equation and of Kohn-Sham equations for the same variational model must lead to the same results. This is obviously false for the simple model cited above. Eqs.(9) of Holas and March give the functional differential δT of the defining Schrödinger orbital functional $T = \sum_i n_i \langle i | \hat{t} | i \rangle$. Because $\rho = \sum_i n_i \rho_i = \sum_i n_i \phi_i^* \phi_i$ in DFT, a sum of orbital densities,

$$\delta T = \sum_i n_i \int d^3\mathbf{r} \{\epsilon_i - v(\mathbf{r})\} \delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})$$

for variations about solutions of the noninteracting Schrödinger equations. This is valid for all density variations induced by orbital variations, whether or not the orbitals are normalized [2]. These equations demonstrate that partial variations $\delta_i T$ of the orbital functional T about stationary states are unique functionals of the partial density variations $\delta\rho_i$ [4]. This implies that the Kohn-Sham ground-state functional $T_s[\rho]$ can be extended to include such infinitesimal variations and defines a density functional derivative for each orbital subshell [2,4],

$$\frac{\delta T}{n_i \delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \epsilon_i - v(\mathbf{r}).$$

This is a Gâteaux functional derivative, the generalization to functional analysis of a partial derivative [5]. A Fréchet derivative, equivalent to a local potential function v_T , exists only if all ϵ_i are equal [4].

The Kohn-Sham density functional T_s is obtained by evaluating T for ground-state orbital functions, restricting functional T_s to normalized ground states of otherwise arbitrary external local potential functions. The fallacy in the argument of Holas and March is that they cannot deduce the functional derivative from this functional, limited to normalized orbitals and densities. They modify Eqs.(9) by replacing the parameters ϵ_i , implied by the Schrödinger equation, by the single parameter μ , appropriate to TFT. This leads to their Eq.(11), which is not consistent with Eqs.(9) unless all integrals $\int \delta\rho_i$ vanish, as they do if all ρ_i are separately normalized. Since this requires independent Lagrange multipliers ϵ_i , replacing them by the single parameter μ is not justified unless all ϵ_i are equal. For fixed orbital normalization, all integrals of constants drop out, so that Eqs.(9) and (11) cannot be distinguished. No conclusion can be drawn about functional derivatives unless the definition of T_s is extended to density variations driven by orbital variations that are unconstrained in the orbital Hilbert space.

Lagrange multiplier formalism requires the relevant functional to be defined for variations unconstrained by normalization [7]. Otherwise Euler-Lagrange variational equations cannot be derived. This motivates the extension of T_s as defined by Kohn and Sham to infinitesimal function-neighborhoods of ground-state densities ρ , generated by infinitesimal variations of the orbital functions ϕ_i [4]. For noninteracting electrons, Fermi-Dirac statistics requires separate normalization of each electronic subshell density, which implies independent Lagrange multipliers ϵ_i indexed by orbital subshells. Unless all these orbital energies are equal, they cannot be replaced by a single parameter μ . TFT uses such a global parameter to normalize the total density, with no reference to shell structure. This is the reason for the historic failure of TFT to describe electronic shell structure [2].

For stationary states, the Gâteaux derivative implied by Eqs.(9) is operationally equivalent to the linear operator $\hat{t}$, because $(\epsilon_i - v)\phi_i = \hat{t}\phi_i$ [2]. It can be expressed as a local mean orbital kinetic energy,

$$\frac{\delta T}{n_i \delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\phi_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \hat{t} \phi_i(\mathbf{r})}{\rho_i(\mathbf{r})}.$$

For independently normalized partial densities ρ_i , this determines modified Thomas-Fermi equations equivalent to the usual Kohn-Sham or Schrödinger equations for noninteracting electrons [6]. This restores Fermi-Dirac statistics and orbital shell structure to Thomas-Fermi theory.

Holas and March cite the work of Englisch and Englisch [8,9] as supporting their argument. This is incorrect, because the rigorous discussion of [8,9] cannot distinguish between Fréchet and Gâteaux functional derivatives. Only normalized density functions are considered, and constants in the Euler-Lagrange equations are not determined. Englisch and Englisch [8] prove the existence in general of a Gâteaux derivative. They do not consider the subshell structure of the DFT density function, but arbitrarily insert a non-indexed single parameter λ into their Eq.(4.1), which if correct would imply an exact TFT. As shown above for the simple example of the lowest $1s2s^3S$ state of an atom with two noninteracting electrons, this result is physically incorrect. Construction of a Gâteaux derivative consistent with the operator $\hat{t}$ in noninteracting Schrödinger equations and in Kohn-Sham equations uses only the mathematics of variational theory in the orbital Hilbert space, following a long tradition of textbook derivations [7].

-
- [1] R. K. Nesbet, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, R12 (1998).
 - [2] R. K. Nesbet, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 010502(R) (2001).
 - [3] A. Holas and N. H. March, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 066501 (2002)
 - [4] R. K. Nesbet, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **81**, 384 (2001).
 - [5] P. Blanchard and E. Brüning, *Variational Methods in Mathematical Physics: A Unified Approach* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992).
 - [6] R. K. Nesbet, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **90**, 262 (2002).
 - [7] R. K. Nesbet, *Variational Principles and Methods in Theoretical Physics and Chemistry* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2002).
 - [8] H. Englisch and R. Englisch, *phys.stat.sol.(b)* **123**, 711 (1984).
 - [9] H. Englisch and R. Englisch, *phys.stat.sol.(b)* **124**, 373 (1984).